ॐ

As fire, being one, on entering the world, is assimilated to form after form; so the inner Self of all being is assimilated to form after form, and yet remains outside them.
—*Katha Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 63 JULY, 1975 NUMBER 9

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

REFLECTIONS ON ANTHROPOLOGY

A CAREFUL reading of *The Secret Doctrine* soon makes it clear that modern evolutionary theory—except for its services in eliminating the need for a Personal God to account for the vast ranges of natural life—was a burdensome distraction from the central task undertaken by H. P. Blavatsky, yet one to which she was obliged to give close attention. Exposition of the origin and nature of man—the two are virtually one, philosophically speaking—is properly fulfilled only by a discussion of human consciousness. Psychogenesis, her major work shows, is also anthropogenesis. The emergence of Mind is the emergence of Man, and his appearance is rather a descent than an ascent.

However, Darwin's *The Origin of Species* had appeared in 1859, and by the time of the launching of the Theosophical Movement —sixteen years later—his theory was well on the way to adoption by the educated people of that time. Indeed, there was great value in the general concept of evolution, as contrasted with the stultifying notion of special creation. And concerning science in general, H.P.B. was explicit in her appreciation of its liberating influence. As she said in the first issue of the *Theosophist*: "Despite all their lack of a higher spiritual intuition, the world's debt to the representatives of modern physical science is immense." She followed this statement with wholly approving quotation from a New England preacher who had declared it "due to Science that we have any conception at all of a *living* God." Science, he maintained,

was disabusing mankind of "hideous illusions" and showing men "how to reason about the things we see." ("What Are the Theosophists?")

Yet there were scientists and scientists. The insistent and apparently persuasive animalism in the thinking of the majority of the evolutionists required forceful criticism from any advocate of the spiritual nature of man, with presentation of what supporting evidence could be made available. The gravity of this obligation may be seen in H.P.B.'s remarks in the section, "Archaic or Modern Anthropology?", in *The Secret Doctrine*.

> We, Theosophists, would willingly bow before such men of learning as the late Prof. Balfour Stewart, Messrs. Crookes, Quatrefages, Wallace, Agassiz, Butlerof, and several others, though we may not agree, from the stand-point of esoteric philosophy, with all they say. But nothing could make us consent to even a show of respect for the opinions of other men of science, such as Hæckel, Carl Vogt, or Ludwig Büchner, in Germany; or even of Mr. Huxley and his co-thinkers in materialism in England—the collossal erudition of the first named, notwithstanding. Such men are simply the intellectual and moral murderers of future generations; especially Hæckel, whose crass materialism often rises to the height of idiotic *naïvetés* in his reasonings. (II, 651.)

Accordingly, the Darwinian doctrine which derives the human species from some unknown ancestor related to the anthropoid apes became a necessary point of attack for H.P.B. There were of course natural scientists of that time who did not share Darwin's views, and who criticized them effectively. Other critics, often scientists, rejected the ape-origin doctrine on psychological and philosophical grounds, but these were a minority; as H.P.B. said, "such metaphysically inclined men of Science are out of court and will hardly be listened to." (II, 654.) At the beginning of the section referred to (II, 645) she described the general situation with regard to anthropological views, objecting to the limitations imposed by Darwinism, and to the readiness of even some of the clergy to submit to this theory:

> Scientists in their anti-clerical enthusiasm and despair of any alternative theory to Darwinism, except that of "special creation," are unconsciously insincere in "forcing" a hypothesis the elasticity of which is inadequate, and which resents the severe strain to which it is now subjected. Insincerity on the same subject is, however, patent in ecclesiastical circles. Bishop Temple has come forward as a thorough-going supporter of Dar-

> winism in his "Religion and Science." This clerical writer goes so far as to regard *Matter*—after receiving its "primal impress" —as the unaided evolver of all cosmic phenomena. This view only differs from that of Hæckel, in postulating a hypothetical deity at "the back of beyont," a deity which stands entirely aloof from the interplay of forces. Such a metaphysical entity is no more the Theological God than that of Kant. Bishop Temple's truce with Materialistic Science is, in our opinion, impolitic—apart from the fact that it involves a total rejection of the Biblical cosmogony. In the presence of this display of flunkeyism before the materialism of our "learned" age, we Occultists can but smile.

What is the outlook today, so far as acceptance of Darwinism is concerned? Basically and popularly, the situation is not much changed, although opinions concerning the genealogical tree of man are now held more as a matter of habit than in brave deviation from old theological teachings. There is still thought to be no choice except that between Darwin's teaching and the Garden of Eden myth. Only a few years ago the California State Board of Education was shaken by heated debate as to whether or not the Bible account of Creation should have "equal space" with evolution theory in public school science texts. There have been changes and refinements, of course, in Darwinism during the twentieth century. The genesis of the species has been pushed back by several million years through the recent discoveries of the Leakeys, father and son, in Africa, and by the remains uncovered by other anthropological diggers. But the quest for the ancestors of man in the form of some primitive, ape-like creature still continues. Only one scientific opponent of notable stature has appeared on the scene since H.P.B.'s time, and this distinguished anatomist, Frederic Wood Jones, seems to have made no impression at all on his scientific contemporaries. His work, however, is valuable and should be noted. Two major correctives to Darwinism were offered by Prof. Jones in his book, *Hallmarks of Mankind* (Williams and Wilkins, 1948):

> The first is that, considered solely from the point of view of structure, Man is an extremely primitive type, and the second that, though more primitive in basal structure than the living monkeys and apes, Man has his own remarkable structural specialisations that distinguish him from all other Mammals and appear to be very ancient hallmarks.

Man, in short, precisely as *The Secret Doctrine* maintains, had his own line of organic evolution, "before the ancestral stocks of

the existing Anthropoid Apes had been developed." These are Dr. Jones's words, and there is no reason to think he had any acquaintance with Theosophical teachings. He wrote, as an anatomist and he also objects to the representations of man in books repeating the Darwinian view. He assembles considerable evidence to oppose the claim that man gradually rose from the stooping posture of an ape to his present upright position. "There is," he says, "no halfway stage in posture."

> It would be better to discard all the drawings that depict the early progenitors of Man as slouching brutes carrying themselves in postures incompatible with the dictates of gravity, and to relegate to oblivion all the speculations and theories concerning the gradual rise of man from a quadrupedal pronograde to a bipedal orthograde posture.

While Prof. Jones offers no extensive theory of his own concerning how man did evolve, he is confident that if the ancestors of man are ever discovered, "they will be utterly unlike the slouching, hairy ape men of which some have dreamed and of which they have made casts and pictures during their waking hours; and they will be found in geological strata antedating the heyday of the great apes."

Prof. Jones rests his case on anatomical studies, drawing upon the same sort of evidence (involving Dollo's Law of Irreversibility) that De Quatrefages and one or two others had pointed to, in the nineteenth century. To the lay reader, his arguments, when understood, are entirely persuasive. But with minor variations and qualifications, mainstream scientific opinion is still vaguely Darwinian. Henry Fairfield Osborne's objections and criticisms of the conventional view (*Science,* May 20, 1927) are forgotten, and while various biologists have expressed strong doubts about the efficacy of Natural Selection, and now and then a neo-Lamarckian presents arguments that are impressive in some respects, the field is still held by the Darwinists, if only, as seems likely, from default of a scientifically acceptable alternative. In other words, the "anti-clerical enthusiasm" of the majority of the scientists of H.P.B.'s day hardened into an unyielding, institutional outlook. It now seems likely that, as with other institutional views, the existing orthodoxy concerning human origins and evolution will gradually wither away rather than submit to refutation by isolated individuals, however sound the arguments provided.

Actually, serious reflection about human nature has been grad-

ually acquiring another polarity during recent years. A number of distinguished thinkers—who might be called advocates of philosophic anthropology—have been wearing away at the assumptions which contributed so largely to making Darwinism scientifically acceptable. The modern physicalist conception of matter and life —born with Galileo and given wide currency by Descartes—is essentially mechanistic. Descartes maintained that the world of nature is ruled by mechanical forces, and that even the organisms of living animals are to be studied by mechanical principles alone. All are automata. While criticism of the implications of the Cartesian outlook and method began as early as the seventeenth century, with the Cambridge Platonists, it had little influence at that time. However, early in the twentieth century, Alfred North Whitehead declared that the demoralization of modern thought was largely owing to the Cartesian way of thinking; Lewis Mumford repeated this theme in *The Myth of the Machine;* and Hans Jonas, in *The Phenomenon of Life,* called attention to the fact that Descartes' view paved the way for the final dehumanization of man by Darwinism—for in this theory, man is no more than an animal, and animals had been shown by Descartes to be but automata, shaped and controlled by blind, mechanistic forces.

We may note, here, that in one of her *Lucifer* articles ("The Substantial Nature of Magnetism") H.P.B. attributed the materialism of scientists to "the Cartesian method with regard to atoms and molecules," while the followers of occultism, in contrast, "hold to the ancient and primitive philosophical beliefs, so intuitively perceived by Leibnitz."

The depressing outcome of the mechanistic assumption for the sciences of man is now widely recognized—as typically represented in the psychology of B. F. Skinner and other Behaviorists. In biology the full implications of the mechanistic view are revealed in the work of Jacques Monod, who asserts in *Chance and Necessity* that pure chance "is today the *sole* hypothesis, the only one that squares with observed and tested fact," to account for the vast panorama of evolution. Meanwhile, emphatic rejection of this outlook has been gaining stronger and stronger expression during the recent years of the twentieth century. One outspoken protest is that of Leon R. Kass, who wrote in *Science* for Nov. 19, 1971:

> There is nothing novel about reductionism, hedonism, and relativism; these are doctrines with which Socrates contended.

> What is new is that these doctrines seem to be vindicated by scientific advance. . . . Here, perhaps, is the most pernicious result of technological progress—more dehumanizing than any actual manipulation or technique, present or future. We are witnessing the erosion, perhaps the final erosion, of the idea of man as something splendid or divine, and its replacement with a view that sees man, no less than nature, as simply more raw material for manipulation and homogenization.

Lewis Mumford, as a cultural historian, has given attention to the blinders worn by anthropological research which focuses solely on ancient "tool-making" abilities, when the quality of the *mind* of primeval man—of *Homo sapiens* rather than *Homo faber*—is manifestly of far greater importance. (*American Scholar,* Winter, 1966-67.) At the same time an entire generation of psychologists has been working assiduously to undermine the underlying mechanistic dynamics of Freudian psychology. One line of this development is ably chronicled in Ira Progoff's *The Death and Rebirth of Psychology*, which shows that the most eminent pupils and associates of Freud, in consequence of their own work with troubled human beings, have turned from materialistic assumptions to one or another form of idealism—leading, in the case of Jung, as his posthumously published work shows, to admission of belief in immortality and reincarnation. A similar line of development, also stemming but departing from Freud, may be seen in the succession of humanistic psychologists beginning, say, with Eric Fromm and Karen Horney and ending with Carl Rogers, Rollo May, and A. H. Maslow. In Maslow, for example, there is frequent reference to the Bodhisattvic ideal of human development, and he has a virtually spiritual conception of man's nature and possibilities, although he was usually disinclined to use the language of religion.

There is hardly any reference to the ape-origin theory in the works of these eminent reformers and reshapers of modern psychology. Deductions from Darwinism concerning human nature have been left mostly to the authors of the "Naked Ape" books which, today, are subject to vigorous attack by humanistic critics.

Finally, attention should be called to the work of Loren Eiseley, a leading anthropologist, whose contribution to the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* was printed as an article in *Saturday Review/World* (Feb. 23, 1974). Instead of stressing the testimony of ancient bones and artifacts unearthed by diggers, Dr. Eiseley writes lyrically, sometimes with almost the same words as Pico della

Mirandola, about the nature of man. Other creatures, the anthropologist says, have instincts to provide for them, but they cannot ask questions. "A fox is a fox, a wolf is a wolf." But man—

> You have learned to ask questions. That is why you are an orphan. *You are the only creature in the universe who knows what it has been.* Now you must go on asking questions while all the time you are changing. You will ask what you are to become. The world will no longer satisfy you. You must find your own way, your own true self.

This is a contemporary anthropologist who recognizes mind as the defining attribute of humans. Quoting a Dead Sea Scroll—"None there be that can rehearse the whole tale"—Dr. Eiseley finds in it "the warning that man is an orphan of uncertain beginnings and an indefinite ending. . . . man's road is to be sought beyond himself." As a philosophical anthropologist, Dr. Eiseley seems more impressed by the uncertainties of man's nature than by the findings of science. He considers the impact of scientific investigation, noting the counsels of Francis Bacon, then says: "Man's conception of himself and his world began to alter beyond recall." As Donne, a contemporary of Bacon put it: "Tis all in pieces, all coherence gone." Today's most thoughtful writers take much the same view of scientific thinking. In *Harper's* for last March, Judson Jerome discusses the great difficulty experienced by modern man in maintaining his self-respect and at the same time attempting to come to terms with the scientific insistence that the human individual is entirely shaped by external forces. "The self itself," Mr. Jerome says, "is a dying metaphor, no more than a knot in a tangle, an intersection in the social network, a phantasm shaped by fields of force." He quotes from a scientific acquaintance whose melancholy conclusion from recent biological speculations seems an echo of the cry of John Donne:

> If we accept that man is not noble, not really a discrete entity, but rather a kind of pliable, malleable creature whose very structure can be modified to suit the ends of others, then our own self-image must begin to change. Instead of a collection of possibly exalted individuals, we become a glob.

This is the final fruit of the materialism which welcomed Darwin's theory with open arms, reveling in its animalistic implications for man, delighting in the shocked sensibilities of all those who resisted the reductionist claims of biology, the determinism of behavioristic psychology, and the statistical approach of sociology.

What were the first principles of the materialism which still

dominates the world of scientific thinking, and against which a new generation of thinkers is now up in arms? Bertrand Russell defined materialism well fifty years ago. In his Introduction to Lange's *History of Materialism* (1925) he said: "The two dogmas that constitute the essence of materialism are: First, the sole reality of matter; secondly, the reign of law." A further statement by Chapman Cohen (in *Materialism Re-Stated,* 1927) completes the account: "The one thing that would be fatal to Materialism would be the necessity for assuming a controlling and directing intelligence at any part of the cosmic process."

So long as these conceptions rule the scientific mind, there is hardly any possibility that scientists will be able to consider, much less embrace, an alternative to the doctrine of human origins proposed by Darwin—which, as Ernst Hæckel said, "puts in the place of a conscious creative force, building and arranging the organic bodies of animals and plants, a series of natural forces working blindly (or we say) without aim, without design." (*Pedigree of Man.*) This is the view which must be replaced, for there to be hope of attention to the Theosophical teaching of man's origin and evolution—a teaching which, admittedly, had little likelihood of scientific acceptance in 1888; for, as H.P.B. wrote in *The Secret Doctrine*:

> In our modern day the mere assertion that there exists a power which can create human forms—ready-made *sheaths* for the "*conscious* monads" or Nirmanakayas of past Manvantaras to incarnate within—is, of course, absurd, ridiculous! . . . As to the origin of that man, not *ex-nihilo,* cemented by a little red clay, but from a living divine Entity consolidating the astral body with surrounding materials—this conception is too absurd even to be mentioned in the opinion of the materialists. Nevertheless, Occultists and Theosophists are ready to have their claims and theories—however unscientific and superstitious at first glance—compared as to their intrinsic value and probability, with those of the modern evolutionists. Hence the esoteric teaching is absolutely opposed to the Darwinian evolution, as *applied to man, and partially* so with regard to other species (II, 652-53).

In another passage H.P.B. provides a general statement of the Theosophic view, giving broad definition to the "directing intelligence" which guides the unfolding potentialities of organic life:

> Darwinism only meets Evolution at its midway point—that is to say when astral evolution has given place to the play of the ordinary physical forces with which our present senses

> acquaint us. But even here the Darwinian Theory, even with the "expansions" recently attempted, is inadequate to meet the facts of the case. The underlying physiological variation in species—one to which all other laws are subordinate and secondary—is a sub-conscious intelligence pervading matter, ultimately traceable to a REFLECTION of the Divine and Dhyan-Chohanic wisdom (II, 649).

Is there, now, more possibility that the Theosophic conception of man's origin, and the teaching of endlessly graded intelligence pervading the cosmos, actively represented by hosts of beings, variously embodied and disembodied, all working in fulfillment of an archetypal scheme of development, will not be rejected as mere absurdity, or "ridiculous"?

The answer to this question will come during the remaining years of this century. Long after *The Secret Doctrine* was written, an emerging maturity of mind and a sharply critical evaluation of the scientific stance began to reshape human attitudes. We have quoted and named several of the writers active in this far-reaching reform, and there are now many others helping to demonstrate that the materialism so staunchly defended for more than two hundred years is itself ridiculous! Eminent among these critical thinkers is Theodore Roszak, whose recent volume, *Where the Wasteland Ends,* marshals the full force of present objections to the materialistic assumption—here summed up as reductionism—reducing man to "nothing but" an animal, material in essence and all its parts. Reductionism, as Kathleen Raine puts it, would have us "see in the pearl nothing but the disease of the oyster." In an opening paragraph in an appendix critical of reductionism, Mr. Roszak shows the long-term effects of the "anti-clerical enthusiasm" of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scientists, and of what H.P.B. termed their "unconscious insincerity":

> There has been, throughout its historical career, an impish streak in science, a desire to shock by an unblushing show of impiety. It can be found as far back as Hobbes, with his brash, aggressive materialism. It is there in Galileo too, both in the rapier wit of his polemics and in his basic assumption of a purely mathematical reality. As E. A. Burtt observes of Galileo's vision of nature: "Man begins to appear for the first time in the history of thought as an irrelevant spectator and insignificant effect of the great mathematical system which is the substance of reality."
>
> Three centuries ago, against a backdrop of oppressively smug religious dogmatism, there may have been a refreshing pro-

> fanity about these reductionist gestures—and certainly a breath-taking courage. Yet seen from another angle, even at their best they call to mind the prankishness of little boys . . . shouting out nauseating and naughty remarks to see how many passers-by they can "turn green." It is a great satisfaction to see arrogant authority taken down a peg: a bit of boyish mischief may serve that end admirably. But once everything in heaven and earth has been debunked twice over and skepticism has settled into a general condition of anomie, we are well past the point of diminishing returns. It is time to ask whether there remains anything in our lives that can be affirmed as being of more than arbitrary and purely sentimental value.

It might be well to read once again H.P.B.'s section, "Archaic or Modern Anthropology?"—which so well summarized the temper of science in her day—and then to consider the great change which has taken place in the years since, for it is well established that at least some scientists now share Roszak's critical views and are making similar expressions from time to time. It may be that a "ninth wave of simple common sense" will open the way to a more philosophical group of natural processes and law, with the result that the spiritual and psychological anthropology of the Secret Doctrine will at last receive serious consideration from a far greater number of inquiring minds.

THE UNIVERSAL MAN

Being a spirit he requires vehicles with which to come in touch with all the planes of nature included in evolution, and it is these vehicles that make him an intricate, composite being, liable to error, but at the same time able to rise above all delusions and conquer the highest place. He is in miniature the universe, for he is as spirit, manifesting himself to himself by means of seven differentiations.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

STUDIES IN ISIS UNVEILED

ADEPTS AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

FROM the first ages of man the fundamental truths of all that we are permitted to know on earth was in the safe keeping of the adepts of the sanctuary. . . . Those guardians of the primitive divine revelation were bound together by a universal freemasonry of science and philosophy, which formed one unbroken chain around the globe.

The difference in creeds and religious practice was only external. Too many of our thinkers do not consider that the numerous changes in language, the allegorical phraseology and evident secretiveness of the old Mystic writers, who were generally under an obligation never to divulge the solemn secrets of the sanctuary, might have sadly misled translators and commentators. The phrases of the medieval alchemist they read literally; and even the veiled symbology of Plato is commonly misunderstood by the modern scholar.

Almost without exception ancient medieval scholars believed in the arcane doctrines of wisdom. These included Alchemy, the Chaldeo-Jewish Kabala, the esoteric systems of Pythagoras and the old Magi, and those of the later Platonic philosophers and theurgists, the Indian gymnosophists and the Chaldean astrologers.

Formerly, magic was a universal science, entirely in the hands of the sacerdotal savant. Though the focus was jealously guarded in the sanctuaries, its rays illuminated the whole of mankind. Otherwise, how are we to account for the extraordinary identity of "superstitions," customs, traditions, and even sentences, repeated in popular proverbs scattered from one pole to the other?

The fables of the mythopoeic ages will be found to have but allegorized the greatest truths of geology and anthropology. It is in these ridiculously expressed fables that science will have to look for her "missing links."

Otherwise, whence such strange "coincidences" in the respective histories of nations and peoples so widely thrown apart? Whence

---

NOTE.—This series is made up of extracts from *Isis Unveiled*, topically arranged. The pages from which the statements are taken are given at the end of each installment. The series was first printed in volumes 5 and 6 of THEOSOPHY.

that identity of primitive conceptions which, fables and legends though they are termed now, contain in them nevertheless the kernel of historical facts, of a truth thickly overgrown with the husks of popular embellishments, but still a truth?

Even the so-called fabulous narratives of certain Buddhistical books, when stripped of their allegorical meaning, are found to be the secret doctrines taught by Pythagoras. What Buddha taught in the sixth century, B.C., in India, Pythagoras taught in the fifth, in Greece and Italy.

There are, scattered throughout the world, a handful of thoughtful and solitary students, who pass their lives in obscurity, far from the rumors of the world, studying the great problems of the physical and spiritual universes. They have their secret records in which are preserved the fruits of the scholastic labors of the long line of recluses whose successors they are. The knowledge of their early ancestors, the sages of India, Babylonia, Nineveh, and the imperial Thebes; the legends and traditions commented upon by the masters of Solon, Pythagoras, and Plato, in the marble halls of Heliopolis and Sais; traditions which, in their days, already seemed to hardly glimmer from behind the foggy curtain of the past;—all this, and much more, is recorded on indestructible parchment, and passed with jealous care from one adept to another. We must bear in mind that authentic treatises upon ancient magic of the Chaldean and Egyptian lore are not scattered about in public libraries, and at auction sales. That such exist is nevertheless a fact.

The keys to the Biblical miracles of old, and to the phenomena of modern days; the problems of psychology, physiology, and the many "missing links" which have so perplexed scientists, are all in the hands of secret fraternities.

No wonder that the Northern seer, Swedenborg, advises people to search for the LOST WORD among the hierophants of Tartary, China, and Thibet; for it is there, and only there now, although we find it inscribed on the monuments of the oldest Egyptian dynasties.

The grandiose poetry of the four Vedas; the Books of Hermes; the Chaldean Book of Numbers; the Nazarene Codex; the Kabala of the Tanaïm; the Sepher Jezira; the Book of Wisdom of Schlomah (Solomon); the secret treatise on Muhta and Badha, attributed by the Buddhist kabalists to Kapila, the founder of the Sankhya system; the Brahmanas; the Stan-Gyour of the Thibetans; all these volumes have the same ground-work. Varying but in

allegories they teach the same secret doctrine which, when once thoroughly eliminated, will prove to be the Ultima Thule of true philosophy, and disclose what is this LOST WORD. Our scientists do not—nay, cannot understand correctly the old Hindu literature. They have a perfect right to the just consciousness of their great learning, but none at all to lead the world into their own error, by making it believe that they have solved the last problem of ancient thought in literature, whether Sanscrit or any other; that there lies not behind the external "twaddle" far more than was ever dreamed of by our modern exact philosophy; or that above and beyond the correct rendering of Sanscrit words and sentences there is no deeper thought, intelligible to some of the descendants of those who veiled it in the morning hours of earth's day, if they are not to the profane reader. No people in the world have ever attained to such a grandeur of thought in ideal conceptions of the Deity and its offspring, MAN, as the Sanscrit metaphysicians and theologians.

Verily the "Christs" of the pre-Christian ages were many. But they died unknown to the world, and disappeared silently and mysteriously. There never was nor ever will be a truly philosophical mind, whether of Pagan, heathen, Jew, or Christian, but has followed the same path of thought.

Who, of those who ever studied the ancient philosophies, who understand intuitionally the grandeur of their conceptions, the boundless sublimity of their views of the Unknown Deity, can hesitate for a moment to give the preference to their doctrines over the incomprehensible dogmatic and contradictory theology of the hundreds of Christian sects? Who that has ever read Plato and fathomed his *To On*, "whom no person has seen except the Son," can doubt that Jesus was a disciple of the same secret doctrine which had instructed the great philosopher? For Plato never claimed to be the inventor of all that he wrote, but gave credit for it to Pythagoras, who, in his turn, pointed to the remote East as the source whence he derived his information and his philosophy.

The mass of cumulative evidence has been reinforced to an extent which leaves little, if any, room for further controversy. A conclusive opinion is furnished by too many scholars to doubt the fact that India was the *Alma-Mater*, not only of the civilization, arts, and sciences, but also of all the great religions of antiquity; Judaism, and hence Christianity, included.

And when we say, indiscriminately, "India," we do not mean

the India of our modern days, but that of the archaic period. In those ancient times, countries which are now known to us by other names were all called India. There was an Upper, a Lower, and a Western India, the latter of which is now Persia-Iran. The countries now named Thibet, Mongolia, and Great Tartary, were also considered by the ancient writers as India.

And now we will try to give a clear insight into one of the chief objects of this work. What we desire to prove is, that underlying every ancient popular religion was the same ancient wisdom-doctrine, one and identical, professed and practiced by the initiates of every country, who alone were aware of its existence and importance. The proofs of this identity of fundamental doctrine in the old religions are found in the prevalence of a system of initiation; in the secret sacerdotal castes who had the guardianship of mystical words of power, and a public display of a phenomenal control over natural forces, indicating association with preterhuman beings. Every approach to the Mysteries of all these nations was guarded with the same jealous care, and in all, the penalty of death was inflicted upon initiates of any degree who divulged the secrets entrusted to them. There was an identity of vows, formulas, rites, and doctrines, between the ancient faiths. Not only is their memory still preserved in India, but also the Secret Association is still alive and as active as ever. The chief pontiff and hierophant, the *Brahmatma,* is still accessible to those "who know," though perhaps recognized by another name; and the ramifications of his influence extend throughout the world.

The secret doctrines of the Magi, of the pre-Vedic Buddhists, of the hierophants of the Egyptian Thoth or Hermes, and of the adepts of whatever age and nationality, including the Chaldean kabalists and the Jewish *nazars,* were *identical* from the beginning. When we use the term *Buddhists* we do not mean to imply by it either the exoteric Buddhism instituted by the followers of Gautama-Buddha, nor the modern Buddhistic religion, but the secret philosophy of Sakyamuni, which in its essence is certainly identical with the ancient wisdom-religion of the sanctuary, the pre-Vedic Brahmanism. By *Buddhism,* therefore, we mean that religion signifying literally the doctrine of wisdom, and which by many ages antedates the metaphysical philosophy of Siddartha Sakyamuni. The building of the Temple of Solomon is the symbolical representation of the gradual acquirement of the *secret* wisdom, or magic; this is the "Temple" which can be reared without the sound of

the hammer, or any tool of iron being heard in the house while it is "in building."

In the East, this science is called, in some places, the "seven-storied," in others, the "nine-storied" Temple; every story answers allegorically to a degree of knowledge acquired. Throughout the countries of the Orient, wherever magic and the wisdom-religion are studied, its practitioners and students are known among their craft as Builders—for they build the temple of knowledge, of secret science.

The "wisdom" of the archaic ages did not die out, and the *Gnosis* still lingers on earth, and its votaries are many, albeit unknown. Such secret brotherhoods have been mentioned by more than one great author. If they have been regarded as mere fictions of the novelist, that fact has only helped the "brother-adepts" to keep their incognito the more easily.

But there are numbers of these mystic brotherhoods which have naught to do with "civilized" countries. Many are the candidates at the doors of those who are supposed to know the path that leads to the secret brotherhoods. The great majority are refused admittance, and these turn away interpreting the refusal as an evidence of the non-existence of any such secret society. Thus these societies will go on and hear themselves denied without uttering a word until the day shall come for them to throw off their reserve and show how completely they are masters of the situation. The present writer states a few facts concerning them, by the special permission of one who has a right to give it. The work now submitted to public judgment is the fruit of a somewhat intimate acquaintance with Eastern adepts and study of their science.

Our work, then, is a plea for the recognition of the Hermetic Philosophy, the anciently universal Wisdom-Religion, as the only possible key to the Absolute in science and theology. The religion of the ancients is the religion of the future. A few centuries more, and there will linger no sectarian beliefs in either of the great religions of humanity. Brahmanism and Buddhism, Christianity and Mahometanism will all disappear before the mighty rush of *facts. No other claim is advanced for a hearing of the opinions contained in the present work than that they are based upon many years' study of both ancient magic and its modern form, Spiritualism.*

NOTE.—The volume and page references to *Isis Unveiled*, from which the foregoing article is compiled, are, in the order of the excerpts, as follows: i, 37-8; i, 205; i, 247; i, 122; i, 291; i, 347; i, 557; i, 558; i, 559; i, 573; i, 580; i, 581; i, 583; ii, 43; ii, 84; ii, 38; ii, 39; ii, 30; i, 589; ii, 98-9; ii, 100; ii, 142; ii, 143; ii, 391-2; ii, 402-4; ii, 307; i, v; i, vii; i, 613; i, 42.

EVERYDAY OCCULTISM

BEINGS below the human stage of evolution are not really beings—they are embodied Qualities, temporary receptacles or storehouses of the energies of consciousness. Their motivating power resides outside of, or beyond, the forms and states we call the elemental, the mineral, the vegetable, the animal. The Life in these forms and states is normally dormant, is static or latent. But it is Life, and so can feel, can react and act, as it comes into collision with other forms and states. Bark and bole, limbs, branches, twigs and leaves, the bud, the blossom, fruit or seed, all draw their quasi-being from the same tree. They have their common identity in the sap, as does the tree itself, but they have no *independent* existence. Existence they have, but each is liened to or absorbed in an enveloping identity, physical, sensational or functional; that is, astral.

What provides the initiatory impulse, what awakes the lowest of the four forms of consciousness in them all? Desire, their own innate, formerly acquired intelligence; Impulse—transmitted shock, whether by intention or incidentally. That external impulse cannot arouse the sleeping life within the form or state, unless it has in it something of the same nature, something in common with the life so stirred. Once psychically energized, which is what impulse means in a conscious sense, then the embodiment of the Qualities leads an apparent existence of its own until the imparted intellectual stimulus is expended. The "Three Qualities" are thus psychological terms for what are otherwise named the three states of "matter," the three "kingdoms" below man, the three universal principles common to and active in *both* spirit and matter. Their temporary mergence constitutes a factitious fourth principle which, in man, we call "Lower Manas" or Kama-Manas—the mind in Nature, the aroused embodied intelligence of Matter.

On the other pole of Life is true Being—true because the only permanent being or possibility of being—the three principles or kingdoms or states of Substance whose existence is in Spirit, not

NOTE.—This article is from a series of essays on the *Bhagavad-Gita* first printed in volume 15 of THEOSOPHY.

Matter. But what may be the meaning of the cryptic phrase "existence in Spirit, not Matter"?

It is this of which all the Sages speak, and it is of this that the *Bhagavad-Gita* treats. Multitudes of men have ever been content to study Spiritual existence in a factual sense, but they interpret that existence in terms of Matter. If they can be happy in matter, and go to some finer form of material existence after death —that is "spiritual existence" to them. Every so-called great religion, and every sect down to the most bizarre and extravagant, is built up on the basis of Spiritual existence as imagined in the mind of mortal men. This is as vain as for the various colors of the spectrum, each of which images a portion or modification of white Light, to be taken as a basis from which to study that Light itself, or its Prism.

We have to get behind the prism, which seems to make of the one Light many lights, of the ONE Life many beings, if we are to reach the reality of the existence called Spiritual. What is, in terms of this symbolism, the Prism?

That prism is Man, the "embodied *self*" of the Fourteenth *Gita*. The "kingdoms" below Man are not in themselves prisms of Life —they are its three primary Rays as reflected on the "screen of Time (*Kala*)."

Here is a view of "reincarnation" that theosophists and others interested in the subject may well ponder. Spiritual man, the "reincarnating Ego" or Self, is not one form of Matter poured into or blended with, mechanically or chemically, a grosser and coarser form of Matter. Man is the Individual Self, the *Adhyatma* of the Eighth chapter, embodied in the highest state and form of Matter, the combined, fully aroused "three qualities" of unorganized Life, temporarily individualized by his Presence—his Image, Lower Manas. Mortal man is a form of Matter, not of Spirit—Matter in *its* three aspects or states of reawakened Intelligence. Man, Spiritual Man, is the Self-aroused Intelligence of Spirit embodied in the *mind* of Nature, or *Prakriti*. Human life is neither Spiritual nor Material, but *co*-existence of Spirit and Matter in one Being or form. It is "individual spirit or *Purusha, invested* with matter," as recited in the Thirteenth chapter. In incarnated man alone are Spirit and Matter in "co-adunition and consubstantiality"—both.

From this co-existence, from the fact of the Ego being "invested" with matter, that Ego is deluded by the Union of Spirit and Matter, into imagining he is what he sees, what he feels, what he

thinks, as the resultant of this temporary union called human life. It is this delusion that has to be overcome by each Ego for itself—and this is the "perfection of spiritual cultivation" for the incarnating Soul.

But what is the effect of this investment and union on "matter" itself—that is to say, on the Lives or Souls or Monads for which Matter is but a collective name, as Spirit is the collective designation of the Self-conscious Souls? By this final stage of triple evolution Matter is educated to self-perception—the hitherto unorganized Lives become in their turn organized instruments of self-consciousness—human Elementals, *lunar* Pitris.

At once the question arises, What are Lunar Pitris?

Here we come direct to the vast teachings contained in H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* concerning the triple scheme of evolution, the three classes of Monads or evolving Souls, and their union in Man. The "incarnating Egos" are spoken of by many names, the most significant of which perhaps, in English terms, are Solar and Lunar Pitris or Dhyanis. These classes and subclasses are covered in the designations of the tenth and eleventh chapters of the *Gita*. Remembering that all language referring to subjects beyond our present ken must necessarily be in terms of symbols, we have to reflect well on the correspondences spiritual and intellectual with the known physical symbolism in the words solar and lunar. We know that the Sun furnishes the *direct* Light in this system; the Moon the *reflected* sunlight; the stars the faint luminosity of far-removed systems as a whole.

Very well, then: the Solar Dhyanis are Self-conscious Monads or Souls; Lunar Pitris, Monads whose consciousness is reflected, is not self-shining. The forms below man have no Being of their own in an intellectual sense, their actions being purely sentient—corresponding to star-light—save as they mirror the ideations of the Self-conscious Monads. In this symbolism, then, every existence below the human is a *Chhaya*—a Shadow-being. The Human Elemental beings, the Lunar Pitris, represent the perfection of material evolution—a thinking, reasoning *animal*-consciousness, in no matter what form. It is this kind of Monads which the Incarnating Egos invested themselves with, by entering their forms (purely *astral*), by absorbing their consciousness (that of "matter"), and thus *identified* themselves with, for the "cycle of incarnation or necessity"—"incarnation" so far as our Egos are concerned, "necessity" so far as the Pitris are involved, since it is only

through *union* that full consciousness is possible. To imagine otherwise is to postulate a miracle. Every Incarnation of every man is the descent of a Divine Being, a God, from the plane of pure Spirit-being to the plane of unorganized Life—Matter. In no other way can these Gods complete their Spiritual evolution; in no other way can Matter be "lifted up" to the plane of Self-consciousness, that is, individualized.

The burden of Arjuna is the burden of his investment with the task of subduing matter, of preparing the hosts of Monads below the human state and stage for higher forms of existence, of awakening the latent intelligence in matter called the "three qualities" in Nature, and fusing into it the sense of identity—that is to say, self-perception. The burden assumed by Krishna is to encourage and guide Arjuna into the reassertion of Spiritual Self-consciousness here in the body—to awaken him from union with Matter, whereupon union with Spirit immediately results.

How is that re-awakening to be achieved by Arjuna?

By *Bhakti*—faith in his own divinity; by *Karma*—action on that basis, which is Dharma, duty done as it presents itself; by *Yoga*, translated by many words but which means self-restraint and self-control in all of them; by *Raja*-Yoga, Self-perception and Self-realization; and hence Union in the full sense.

In the eighteenth chapter all these are remarshaled and Man is deliberately called the Supreme Being when he has realized in himself and for himself the truth of Life, as Krishna has done, and as Arjuna is at the point of doing.

There is nothing in the whole galaxy of evolutionary initiation more inviting to the student than the closing words of Arjuna:

> "By thy divine power, O thou who fallest not, my delusion is destroyed. I am collected once more; I am free from doubt, firm, and will act according to thy bidding."

What constitutes the "divine power" of Krishna or any other "embodiment of the Supreme Spirit"? It is indicated by the word *achyuta*—"who fallest not." Krishna, having achieved true Yoga, could incarnate without falling into the delusion of a false sense of self. Never could he confuse his own identity with his faith, his works, his qualities. Arjuna at last recognizes that this is what has befallen himself and has been the source of all his bewilderments. He knows that he is Life, regardless of any and all of its modifications, and so will henceforth be able to "enter into the being" of

any modification of Life without loss, obscuration, or reversal of his own Divinity—his Spiritual Self-consciousness.

And so, Arjuna has passed from death which he thought to be life, to that being in which all existence and existences are encompassed. He has entered once and for all into his own Being.

In the *Voice of the Silence,* which H.P.B. avowedly "dedicated to the few" who truly seek contact with Krishna, she makes that Voice speak to Arjuna in these words:

> "Behold! thou hast become the Light, thou hast become the Sound, thou art thy Master and thy God, thou art THYSELF the object of thy search: the VOICE unbroken, that resounds throughout eternities, exempt from change, from sin exempt, the Seven Sounds in one,
>
> THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE."

CONSCIOUSNESS IN INCARNATION

The phenomena of divine consciousness have to be regarded as activities of our mind on another and a higher plane, working through something less substantial than the moving molecules of the brain. They cannot be explained as the simple resultant of the cerebral physiological processes, as indeed the latter only condition them or give them a final form for purposes of concrete manifestation.

For, as Occultism teaches, if the Higher Mind-Entity—the permanent and the immortal—is of the divine homogeneous essence of "Alaya-Akasa," or Mahat,—its reflection, the Personal Mind, is, as a temporary "Principle," of the Substance of the Astral Light. As a pure ray of the "Son of the Universal Mind," it could perform no functions in the body, and would remain powerless over the turbulent organs of Matter. Thus, while its inner constitution is Manasic, its "body," or rather functioning essence, is heterogeneous, and leavened with the Astral Light, the lowest element of Ether. It is a part of the mission of the Manasic Ray, to get gradually rid of the blind, deceptive element which, though it makes of it an active spiritual entity on this plane, still brings it into so close contact with matter as to entirely becloud its divine nature and stultify its intuitions.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

letters • questions • comment

What characterizes the "soul" in man? In The Ocean of Theosophy *it is described as being either rational or irrational. But then Mr. Judge goes on to say that from the threefold scheme of spirit, soul and body can be derived the rest of the sevenfold constitution of theosophical teachings, "because the four other divisions missing from the category can be found in the powers and functions of body and soul. . . ." How is soul both the "acquired knowledge" (as it is sometimes described) and the rational and irrational in man?*

Soul refers broadly to the embodiment of Spirit in matter. From the standpoint of incarnation, "irrational" refers to the mind involved in and dominated by matter; while "rational" applies to the functioning of higher mind as the guiding influence in matter under its direction. But "irrational" in the sense of "supra rational" may be used to indicate that higher mind no longer needs to reason from premise to conclusion, being capable of "looking directly on ideas"; while "rational" represents the ability to make distinctions and comparisons. This reasoning aspect of intellect is developed by egos in incarnation. In *The Key to Theosophy* (p. 102), H.P.B. shows its duality:

> You have to learn the difference between that which is negatively, or *passively* "irrational," because undifferentiated, and that which is irrational because too *active* and positive. Man is a correlation of spiritual powers, as well as a correlation of chemical and physical forces, brought into function by what we call "principles."

The duality of the mind is the condition of our evolution, the soul in its polarity of functions and powers on every plane of consciousness being the actor. In general, it is spirit in action. Specifically, it may refer to the lower energies or animal soul; to the self-consciousness that is uniquely human—the human soul; or to Buddhi-Manas, the higher mind fully awake in incarnation—the spiritual soul. Mr. Crosbie's comment on the difference between soul and spirit is suggestive:

> Spirit is universal. It cannot be said to belong to anything or

> anybody. It is like the air, universal and everywhere. It cannot know Itself except as Soul. Spirit is the "power to become"; Soul is "the becoming." Spirit is the power to see and know; Soul is the seeing and knowing. Soul is the accumulation of perceptions and experiences by means of which Spiritual Identity is realized. (*Answers to Questions on The Ocean of Theosophy*, p. 21.)

Mr. Crosbie comments elsewhere that "there is a spiritual aroma in every pleasing thing"; and that we can easily forget the heroic character of our undertaking here in pursuing these "aromas." He goes on to say that contracting this risk is one of the necessities of awakening the matter of this period of evolution:

> This so-called "descent" was necessary in order for us to know matter in its various divisions and phases—in other words, to understand the nature of other and smaller lives. The real purpose is not achieved by eternally living among them and upon them; and desire arises from pursuing what is pleasant among them and avoiding the unpleasant. Nature is composed of heterogeneous lives. In using them we pursue those which are homogeneous with our acquired nature and endeavor to avoid those that are not. From this, desire and aversion arise. (*Answers to Questions on The Ocean of Theosophy*, p. 235.)

It seems that we have evolved many kinds of bodies, mostly through desire and aversion—"sheaths of the mortal man," as Mr. Judge put it—created by our vast powers of thought. But man is more than these, and soul is not a "thing" but a becoming: it is at once the act of creating, of identifying ourselves as that which we have created, and of outgrowing these forms by seeing that they are not the self, but only its embodiments. Through the aspirations of the personal man for a more universal perspective in thought and action, the mind becomes the bridge (*antaskarana*) to universal being. The orbit of this cyclic becoming is the reach of the life of the soul.

on the lookout

Paine's "Passionate Tract"

In *The Age of Reason*, Thomas Paine wrote:

> There are two distinct classes of thoughts; those produced by reflection, and those that bolt into the mind of their own accord. I have always made it a rule to treat these voluntary visitors with civility, and it is from them I have acquired all the knowledge that I have.

In a book published in 1973 by the Library of Congress, *Fundamental Testaments of the American Revolution*, in observation of the Bicentennial Program, the first essay, by Bernard Bailyn, is on Paine's pamphlet, *Common Sense*. As author of books devoted to the thinking which lay back of and led to the American Revolution, Prof. Bailyn was well qualified to write this chapter about the unique qualities of Paine's stirring appeal to the people of the American colonies. Paine had been in America only fourteen months when Benjamin Franklin invited him to write a history of the controversy between the English and the Americans, then arousing so much debate. Paine, says Prof. Bailyn, made the invitation into "the occasion for composing a passionate tract for American independence." It was a work, the historian says, which evoked, "with superb vigor and with perfect intonation, longings and aspirations that have remained part of American culture to this day."

A Changed Outlook

It seems wholly just to call Paine's *Common Sense* a prophetic writing. With the help, almost certainly, of some of those "voluntary visitors" to his mind he later referred to, Paine looked into the future and saw the high possibilities and opportunities of American independence. Prof. Bailyn points out that in those days independence was not widely thought of except by a handful of "radicals." Most of the colonists wanted only what they conceived to be "justice" and due consideration for their rights from the mother country. Paine virtually ridiculed this submissive mood.

His prose was a torch intended to burn away the idea of American dependency.

> The great intellectual force of *Common Sense* lay not in its close argumentation on specific points but in its reversal of the presumptions that underlay the arguments, a reversal that forced thoughtful readers to consider, not so much a point here and a conclusion there, but a wholly new way of looking at the entire range of problems involved. For beneath all of the explicit arguments and conclusions against independence, there were underlying, unspoken, even unconceptualized presuppositions, attitudes, and habits of thought that made it extremely difficult for the colonists to break with England and find in the prospect of an independent future the security and freedom they sought. The special intellectual quality of *Common Sense,* which goes a long way toward explaining its impact on contemporary readers, derives from its reversal of these underlying presumptions and its shifting of the established perspectives to the point where the whole received paradigm within which the Anglo-American controversy had until then proceeded came into question.

Thrusts and Visions

Prof. Bailyn shows with quotation both the eloquence and the vision of Paine, and also his spirited denunciations of tyrannical monarchist authority. Respect for royalty could hardly survive his sallies. What was the heritage of the English kings?

> No man in his senses can say that their claim under William the Conqueror is a very honorable one. A French bastard, landing with an armed banditti and establishing himself king of England against the consent of the natives, is in plain terms a very paltry rascally original.

He was also lyrical:

> The sun never shined on a cause of greater worth. . . . 'Tis not the concern of a day, a year, or an age; posterity are virtually involved in the content, and will be more or less affected even to the end of time by the proceedings now. Now is the seed-time of continental union, faith, and honor. . . . O ye that love mankind! Ye that dare to oppose not only the tyranny but the tyrant, stand forth! Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger, and England hath given her warning to depart. O! receive the fugitive, and prepare in time an asylum for mankind.

Paine's own vision has since become well known. He fought

gainst slavery—to no avail in his time—and he fought against logma in religion, again to no avail so far as the great majority were concerned, who turned against him for his attacks on the Bible as a divinely inspired work. Yet Paine in many ways accomplished what he set out to do. He helped all Americans to look forward to an age of opportunity—and to responsibilities that still lie sadly unfulfilled.

"Adepts in America"

It is of interest to recall here, as related in an editors' note introducing Mr. Judge's article, "The Adepts in America in 1776," in THEOSOPHY for July, 1933 (vol. 21: 390), that Count St. Germain persuaded Baron Von Steuben to go to the assistance of the American colonists, and it is reasonable to think that a similar influence brought the Marquis de La Fayette to these shores. The editors' note also reproduces an extract from a letter by La Fayette to General Washington, in which he speaks of having learned interesting secrets from a "German doctor, called Mesmer," who had made "a grand philosophical discovery." Also in this issue of THEOSOPHY is H.P.B.'s reply to an Indian critic of Mr. Judge's article (which had been published in the *Theosophist*), in which she said that "several Brothers of the Rosie Cross—or 'Rosicrucians,' so called—did take a prominent part in the American struggle for independence, as much as in the French Revolution during the whole of the past [eighteenth] century."

Definition of "Synergy"

In the curious language, almost a jargon, that he has evolved, at once both impetuous and technical, Buckminster Fuller gives effective expression to basic philosophical conceptions in his article, "Time Present," in *Harper's* for March. For example, he begins by defining the meaning of "Synergy," which may be recognized as a way of speaking of the law of brotherhood—the extraordinary fruit of the practice of unity within the focus of relationships of diverse units. While the engineering terms employed may seem morally neutral, the underlying implication is of the wider fulfillments brought to conscious beings—and to all beings—through the realization of unity in diversity. "Synergy," Mr. Fuller says, "means behavior of whole systems unpredicted by the behavior of their parts taken separately." Synergy, he adds, "alone explains the eternally regenerative integrity of Universe." Some students may

recall the use made of the idea of synergy by the cultural anthropologist, Ruth Benedict, and its extensive quotation by A. H. Maslow to show the remarkable multiplication of benefits to the entire community which results from the generous action of individuals for the common good.

"Nature Is Conceptual"

Mr. Fuller is convinced that mind is the source of primary causation—cosmically as well as in other respects.

> The greatest of all the faculties is the ability of the imagination to formulate conceptually. Conceptuality is subjective; realization is objective. Conceptuality is metaphysical and weightless; reality is physical. . . .
>
> Nature is conceptual. This is the difference between visibility and invisibility. The invisible does not mean nonconceptual. Conceptuality is independent of visibility or invisibility. You can have conceptuality, or an understanding of the principles, independent of size, which makes it possible to conceive of events as they occur at magnitudes that would be subvisible or supravisible. Conceptuality operates experimentally, independent of size.

The classic expression of the principles here considered may be found in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 660 fn.):

> From Phidias down to the humblest workman in the ceramic art—a sculptor has had to create first of all a model in his mind, then sketch it in one and two dimensional lines, and then only can he reproduce it in a three-dimensional or objective figure. And if human mind is a living demonstration of such successive stages in the process of evolution—how can it be otherwise when NATURE'S MIND and creative powers are concerned.

Time and Timelessness

"Time," it is said in *The Secret Doctrine*, "is only an illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration, and it does not exist where no consciousness exists in which the illusion can be produced; but 'lies asleep'." (I, 37.) Mr. Fuller says:

> Time is not the fourth dimension and should not be so identified. Time is only a relative observation, a set of local sequences of experience after-image formulation lags of the brain. Time is not a function of space. We can discuss time as if there were no time. It exists in weightless, metaphysical conceptuality. There is a metaphysical timeless time. Instant-

aneity would eliminate otherness, time, and self-and-other-awareness. Instantaneity and eternity are both timeless: they are the same.

The Web of Relativities

Recognizing the relativity of all finite knowledge (*Samvritti*), Mr. Fuller draws interesting conclusions about modern cosmological conceptions and the attempt to discover the ultimate "building blocks" of the universe:

> We can pick up any one dictionary and discover that it is a nice finite package. We can open one page, but we cannot look at all the words at once. If we cannot look at all the words even on one page, we certainly cannot look at all the words of a whole dictionary at once. It does not make the dictionary infinite because we cannot look at all the words at once or think about all the words at once. The inability to think about everything at once does not mean that experience or consideration of experience is infinite. It is perplexing that one of the most persistent contemplations of human beings has been predicated on a static concept of Universe, the kind of Universe as a fixed, static picture, which we try to do when people ask where the outwardness of Universe ends. Humans try to get a finite unit package. We have a monological propensity for the *thing*, the *key*, the *building block* of Universe. What we discover here is that it is not possible to think about all Universe at once. It is nonsimultaneously conceptual. This in no way mitigates against its finiteness and thinkableness.

On "Life"

> Life is the eternal present in the temporal. Life is the *now* event with reaction *past* and resultant *future*. Each individual life is a special-case articulation of the infinite variety of "scenarios" to be realized within the multidegrees of freedom and the vast range of frequencies of actions that are accommodated by the generalized laws governing Universe. With death, the individual probably loses nothing but gains the insight and knowledge of all others as well.

This closing observation escapes criticism if we allow Mr. Fuller to skip to the finality of Nirvanic fulfillment, as contrasted with the devachanic interlude, but even in devachan there is a kind of "realization" which corresponds, in a limited way, to the realization that becomes possible at the end of a great cycle of evolution.

While, here and there, a student of Theosophy might express such ideas differently—he would not, for example, call reality "physical"—there seems a basic and intuitive fitness in Mr. Fuller's

conceptions. Since he is widely admired and influential, publication of these reflections should have an emancipating and provocative effect on the serious thought of the time.

Secret Gospels

In *Isis Unveiled* (II, 181-82), after giving an account of the Ebionites—a kabalistic gnostic sect to which all the surviving relatives of Jesus belonged—H.P.B. remarks that quite evidently the apostles had received a "secret doctrine" from Jesus. She repeats the admission of Jerome that Matthew had left a Gospel which he *"did not wish to be openly written,"* adding that Jerome knew "that this *original Gospel of Matthew* was the expounder of the only true doctrine of Christ," and that the canonical version, written in Greek instead of Hebrew, was spurious. Yet Jerome could not understand it, since its contents were arcane and secret, nor would he accept it, since neither the Nazarenes nor the Ebionites accepted the *divinity* of Christ. Even though Matthew was an evangelist "who had been the friend and companion of Jesus," for Jerome to have approved his secret gospel would have been equivalent "to reading the death-sentence of the established Church."

Letter by Clement

Further evidence that Jesus taught a "secret doctrine" turned up recently in the discovery of a letter by Clement of Alexandria in the library of a Greek Orthodox monastery a dozen miles southwest of Jerusalem. This find is described by its discoverer, Morton Smith, in *The Secret Gospel* (Harper & Row, 1973). Looking through old manuscripts, Prof. Smith came across "a text written in a tiny scrawl," which was headed, "From the letters of the most holy Clement, the author of the *Stromateis*." Clement, it will be recalled, was a church father of Alexandria (150-220), a philosophizing Christian who originally had been a Platonist. H.P.B. terms him a renegade for attacking the Greek Mysteries (*Isis* II, 100), despite the fact that he was generally honest and learned. He stigmatized the Mysteries as indecent and diabolical. Interestingly, the occasion for the letter found by Prof. Smith is a similar attack on the Carpocratians, a gnostic sect which apparently had possession of the "secret" version of the Gospel of Mark, to which Clement refers. He tells his correspondent, named Theodore, that while some of the things the Carpocratians quote from the secret gospel are true, other statements are false or mixed with invention, leading to blasphemy and indecency.

ecret Rite

Much of Prof. Smith's book is an account of his consultations ith other scholars to verify the authenticity of the letter by Clemnt. Once assured of its genuineness, he proceeded to an analysis f its contents. Apart from the attack on the Carpocratians, the ost interesting element is the letter's additions to the story of esus' raising Lazarus from the dead. In the secret gospel, as reeated by Clement, after Lazarus has been restored to life, Jesus ad Lazarus come with him, clad only in a linen cloth, and then remained with him that night, for Jesus taught him the mystery f the kingdom of God." This "mystery" Prof. Smith regards as a ecret sort of baptism known to Jesus as a Gnostic "magician." Baptism—for Jesus much more than washing in water—*"was the mystery of the Kingdom—the mystery rite by which the kingdom was entered."*

Meaning of Baptism

Following the suggestion of another scholar, Prof. Smith concludes that the "ordinary" *Gospel of Mark* was used by the early Christians for those who had not been baptized, that a version of *Mark* with secret additions was used for baptism, while the true gnostic was instructed in the unwritten tradition which Mark did not write down. Prof. Smith says that the Greco-Roman world was full of "secret teachings," and that reports of Jesus' secret activities are referred to throughout the Gospels. "When he did teach in public, he taught in parables and cryptic sayings." Prof. Smith finds reason to think that the baptism Jesus gave was an initiation permitting the candidate to unite with him in death and resurrection—a second birth, in other words. This suggestion is drawn from Paul, implying a process by which one's life is merged with that of the Messiah. What this may have meant is probably best determined by a reading of H.P.B.'s article, "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels," the chief service performed by Prof. Smith being his confirmation that Jesus did indeed teach a "secret doctrine"—and one, moreover, hardly understood or dreamed of by modern Christians. As for Clement's attack on the Carpocratians, Prof. Smith says that Clement quotes from Epiphanes, Carpocrates' son, against them, but since Epiphanes, as C. E. King remarks in *The Gnostics and Their Remains,* saved himself from persecution by turning "State's evidence" against the Gnostics, his condemnation of the Carpocratians may have no more

ground than Clement's denunciation of the Greek mysteries. Meanwhile, a further benefit of Prof. Smith's work is its general confirmation of James M. Robinson's statement, in relation to the Nag Hammadi Gnostic texts, that all the New Testament writers drew their thought patterns from a "gnosticizing milieu."

Drugging Children

Among the more flagrant abuses of tranquilizing drugs is their indiscriminate application to behavior problems in young children. In the *Progressive* for March, T.A. Vonder Haar says that the widespread use of these drugs is promoted not only by drug companies, but also by doctors and educational personnel in order to control children who are not docile. Substances having side-effects such as dizziness, loss of appetite and insomnia, with still unknown long-range influence, are given to children in whom no definite, organic malfunction has been noted. While it is possible, the *Progressive* writer says, that children in whom some definite nervous disorder has been detected may be helped by amphetamines, their application as a panacea may mask more serious symptoms. Even more disturbing is the insistence on their use by educational "authorities." This policy, if it has the widespread application that the *Progressive* writer suggests, may be recognized as a rigid, hostile response to the needs of a coming generation with psychic qualities and tendencies different from those of the children of past years. H.P.B. suggested that in the present period the psychic idiosyncrasies of humanity would "enter on a great change," and it seems in no way remarkable that indications of this change should already be evident in the young.

Mr. Vonder Haar says:

> Whatever their purpose, educators and teachers seem determined to drug the kids. Congressional committees investigating the distribution and consumption of amphetamines have been swamped with complaints from parents around the country claiming pressure and harassment from teachers and principals to put their kids on Ritalin. Some parents have been threatened with censure by local medical societies, and others have been told their children would be expelled from school if medication were not agreed to.

Procrustean Substitute

The use of drugs to control disruptive children makes it unnecessary for adults to inquire more deeply into what may be the under-

ing causes of the problems. The classroom situation, for instance, ay be frustrating, boring, or in other ways unsuitable for alert, nergetic children. Mr. Vonder Haar quotes Bruno Bettelheim, ho said that "many adults show all the behavior characteristics of e hyperkinetic child: high energy, aggressiveness, lack of inhibi-on, insistence on having their own way," which are quite natural eactions in persons forced into "passive behavior." Using drugs nstead of providing an environment responsive to the eagerness nd efforts of children may lead to the development of a genera-on of young unacquainted with themselves or the world they ve in, because of dulled senses and passive perceptions. The *Pro-ressive* writer considers this possibility:

> The question as to whether amphetamine treatment of "hyperkinetic" children results in addiction over the long run cannot be answered, because of the lack of data. But the question, nevertheless, must be seriously considered. Even if a child is not physiologically addicted, he may be psychologically inclined to resort to chemicals as an escape from the occasional onslaughts of the real world.

Belated Recognition

> One physician stopped prescribing amphetamines for children when he realized that many of his patients continued their reliance on the drug for as long as twenty years. One twenty-six-year-old patient came to realize that during his formative years, from ages eight to twenty-six, he had never been free from the influence of Ritalin. His perceptions and interactions with reality, his personality, and his whole being were developed under the influence of Ritalin. He can only speculate as to what might have been without the influence of the drug. It was a bit late for him to realize that the daily consumption of amphetamine-like medicines embalms the personality, preserving the individual from the satisfaction of achievement, and from other feelings, relationships, and events that affect human beings. The pickling of young patients, a sort of final solution, deprives the patient of essential aspects of his humanity.

Duty of Elders

Inspired, perhaps by Justice Douglas' dissent in the Mineral King case, declaring that creatures of field and stream—and even rivers and meadows—have rights which entitle them to a voice before the courts, Gary Snyder suggests in the Winter 1974-75 *Living Wilderness* that both democracy and humanism should be redefined to include representation of all nature. Taking part in a seminar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, the

poet proposed that the Center had responsibility for restoring ecological conscience to American civilization:

> This institute—this Center—is of the order of a kiva of elders. Its function is to maintain and transmit the lore of the tribe on the highest levels. If it were doing its job completely, it would have a cycle of ceremonies geared to the seasons, geared perhaps to the migrations of the fish and to the phases of the moon. It would be able to instruct in what rituals you follow when a child is born, when someone reaches puberty, when someone gets married, when someone dies. But, as you know, in these fragmented times, one council cannot perform all these functions at one time. Still it would be understood that a council of elders, the caretakers of the lore of the culture, would open themselves to representation from other life-forms. Historically this has been done through art.

Giving Voice to Other Life-Forms

> The paintings of bison and bears in the caves of southern France were of that order. The animals were speaking through the people and making their point. And when, in the dances of the Pueblo Indians and other peoples, certain individuals became seized, as it were, by the spirit of the deer, and danced as a deer would dance, or danced the dance of the corn maidens, or impersonated the squash blossom, they were no longer speaking for humanity, they were taking it on themselves to interpret, through their humanity, what these other life-forms were. That is about all we know so far concerning the possibilities of incorporating spokesmanship for the rest of life in our democratic society.

Interestingly, a professor of law at the University of Southe California, Christopher D. Stone, suggested recently (in his bo *Should Trees Have Standing?*) that the Supreme Court of t United States might have as its highest function—more import than settling legal issues—the "summoning up from the hum spirit the kindest and most generous and worthy ideas that abou there, giving them shape and reality and legitimacy." This i new way of thinking about formal human institutions—as thou their moral influence as "a council of elders" counted for mu more than their practical function.

Gary Snyder's choice of the Pueblo Indians as an example follow seems a happy one, since the institutions of these people the American Southwest embody ancient principles of relationsh which keep alive ancient truths, as Madame Blavatsky points in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 628-29).